

NOTES ON THE *HERACLIDAE* OF EURIPIDES¹

Hclid. 226–31

ἀλλ' ἄντομαί σε καὶ καταστέφω χεροῖν
καὶ πρὸς γενείου, μηδαμῶς ἀτιμιάσης
τοὺς Ἡρακλείους παῖδας ἐς χέρας λαβεῖν.
γενοῦ δὲ τοῖσδε συγγενῆς, γενοῦ φίλος
πατήρ ἀδελφός δεσπότης· ἅπαντα γὰρ
ταῦτ' ἐστὶ κρείσσω πλὴν ὑπ' Ἀργείους πεσεῖν.

228 λαβεῖν Elmsley, λαβών L

I start at the end. Iolaus appeals to Demophon (229–31): 'become their kinsman, friend, father, brother, master: *all this* is better than falling into the hands of the Argives.' One should hope so. When Pearson² comments 'ἅπαντα: i.e. submission to Demophon is better than subjection by the Argives. The remark is prompted by δεσπότης, the climax of the preceding appeal', he is unconsciously repeating what had been said by Herwerden, *R.Ph.* n.s. xvii (1893), 236: 'manifestum est ἅπαντα κτέ. ad solum δεσπότης referri posse, nam praegressa omnia συγγενῆς, φίλος, πατήρ, ἀδελφός sunt eiusmodi quae nemo non sibi exoptet.' How they can even consider the possibility that ἅπαντα may refer to one item only in a list of five I do not know. Speculation is fortunately cut short by Herwerden, who proceeds: 'absurde igitur, quod neminem observasse miror, dictum est HAEC omnia Argiuorum servituti praefenda esse, quasi uero ea de re dubitari posset.' For ταῦτ' substitute not Herwerden's πάντ' but τᾶλλ', an unnoticed conjecture of C. Häberlin (*N. Jahrb. f. Philol.* cxli [1890], 26). The turn of phrase, the corruption, and the cure, all find a parallel in Soph. *Ant.* 439–40 ἀλλὰ πάντα ταῦθ' ἥσσω λαβεῖν | ἐμοὶ πέφυκε τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας, where Blaydes wrote πάντα τᾶλλ' and Housman (*J.Ph.* xx [1892], 26–7) τᾶλλα πάνθ', which Pearson prints in the Oxford text. Similar in expression is Eur. fr. 731 οὐκ ἔστι κρείσσον ἄλλο πλὴν κρατεῖν δορί, quoted by Elmsley. The corruption of τᾶλλα to ταῦτα recurs at *Hel.* 1554.

Iolaus begins his appeal at 226: 'I beseech you, and I garland you with my hands, and by your beard, do not disdain to take the children of Heracles under your protection.'³ Various methods have been devised for avoiding the incoherence in the sequence ἄντομαι καὶ καταστέφω καὶ πρὸς γενείου. The worst and earliest first: καὶ κατὰ στεφῶν χεροῖν, 'et per coronas in manibus meis', Markland on *Su.* 259. Musgrave, Pflugk, Bothe, and Paley take χεροῖν καὶ πρὸς γενείου in the manner of Δελφῶν κάπὸ Δαυλίας; but, as Pearson says, 'Hec. 752 ἱκετεύω σε . . . δεξιᾶς τ' εὐδαίμονος, *Hipp.* 605 ναὶ πρὸς σε τῆς σῆς δεξιᾶς εὐωλένου are insufficient to justify an appeal πρὸς χεροῖν.' And καταστέφω is not to be interpreted literally, since the speaker has no suppliant garlands to offer. The meaning of καταστέφω χεροῖν is established, as Elmsley was first to see, by *Andr.* 894–5 στεμμάτων δ' οὐχ ἥσσονας | σοῖς προστίθημι γόνασιν ὠλένας

¹ I am indebted to Professor Sir Denys Page for helpful criticisms.

² 'The *Heracidae*' ed. A. C. Pearson, Cambridge 1907.

³ All that needs to be said in support of Elmsley's λαβεῖν in 228 has been said by Pearson.

ἐμάς and *I.A.* 1216–17 ἵκετηρίαν δὲ γόνασιν ἐξάπτω σέθεν | τὸ σῶμα τοῦμόν. Pearson adds *Or.* 382–3 τῶν σῶν δὲ γονάτων πρωτόλεια θυγάνω | ἱκέτης, ἀφύλλον στόματος ἐξάπτων λιτάς, as further illustration of ‘this to us somewhat euphuistic metaphor’. But Elmsley’s claim that καὶ πρὸς γενεῖον is used ‘quasi superiore uersu praecedat ἀλλ’ ἄντομαί σε πρὸς γονάτων’ is ineffectual. Kirchhoff proposed μὴ πρὸς γενεῖον, and this is printed by Nauck, Wecklein, Pearson, and Méridier, and approved by G. Zuntz, *The political plays of Euripides* (Manchester 1955), 107. This causes an awkward transition from knees to beard: ‘I garland your knees with my hands; do not, by your beard, . . .’. Such asyndeton would be possible only if the speaker had said ‘I place my hands on your chin.’ H. Usener (*N. Jahrb. f. Philol.* cxxxix [1889], 371) deleted line 227. Blaydes (*Adu. crit. in Eur.* [Halle 1901], 113) suggested ναὶ πρὸς γενεῖον, which is quite inappropriate. Murray marks aposiopesis after καί, a subterfuge which replaces one form of incoherence by another.

Change καταστέφω to the participle: ἀλλ’ ἄντομαί σε καὶ καταστέφων χεροῖν | καὶ πρὸς γενεῖον, ‘I beseech you, both garlanding your knees with my hands, and by your beard.’ For the linking of participle and prepositional phrase or its equivalent, see 6 αἰδοῖ καὶ τὸ συγγενὲς σέβων, 194–5 τῇ δίκῃ μὲν οὐ, | τὸ δ’ Ἄργος ὀγκῶν, *Hec.* 346–7 τοῦ τ’ ἀναγκαίου χάριν | θανεῖν τε χρήζουσ’, 1197–8 πόνον ἀπαλλάσσω διπλοῦν | Ἀγαμέμνονός θ’ ἕκατι, *Andr.* 805 πατρός τ’ ἐρημωθεῖσα συννοίαι θ’ ἄμα, 947–9 ἡ μὲν τι κερδαίνουσα . . . ἡ δ’ ἀμπλακοῦσα . . . πολλὰ δὲ μαργότῃ, *Pho.* 1592–3 οὐχ ὕβρει λέγω | οὐδ’ ἐχθρὸς ὦν σός, *Or.* 118–19 φόβωι προσελθεῖν μνῆμα σὸν ταρβοῦσά τε | Ἀργεῖον ὄχλον, *Soph. Ai.* 176–8 ἡ ποῦ τινος νίκας ἀκάρπτωτον χάριν, ἥ ῥα κλυτῶν ἐνάρων ψευσθεῖς’ εἴτ’ ἐλαφαβολαῖς, *Tr.* 239 εὐκταῖα φαίνων ἡ ’πὸ μαντείας τινός; *Thuc.* 1. 49. 3 ὑπὸ τε τοῦ πλήθους καὶ ὄχλου τῶν νεῶν καὶ μᾶλλον τι πιστεύοντες, and we should perhaps add *Eur. I.T.* 15 δεινῇ τ’ ἀπλοῖαι (*Madvig*, δεινῆς τ’ ἀπλοῖας *L.*) πνευμάτων τ’ οὐ τυγχάνων.

788–9

Αλ. ὦ φίλαθ’, ἦδε σ’ ἡμέρα διήλασεν
ἐλευθερῶσαι τοῖσδε τοῖς ἀγγέλασι.
ἡλευθερῶσθαι *l*

The messenger reports victory and Alcmena rewards him with his freedom. It is as profitable to extract sunbeams from cucumbers as to extract sense and grammar from the words διήλασεν ἐλευθερῶσαι (ἡλευθερῶσθαι). ‘The problem of finding a substitute for διήλασεν’, writes Jackson, *Marginalia scaenica*, p. 238, ‘capable of being followed by an accusative and infinitive, has proved insoluble.’ Reiske’s διήνυσεν was never attractive; and Jackson’s objection to Elmsley’s διήγαγεν, which has attracted many, is cogent.¹ In the next line his own conjecture ἡλευθέρωσαι (‘you are freed for your good tidings’) is almost irresistible—almost, for it may still be worth suggesting ἐλευθερῶ σε. But the same lightness of touch does not distinguish his proposal κατήγαγεν for διήλασεν (‘this day has restored you to your native land’). Such encouragement would cheer the wandering children of Heracles; but return from exile is no proper blessing to wish upon a slave. And the asyndeton which Jackson has created between lines 788 and 789 leads us to expect that the granting of freedom will

¹ Wecklein’s catalogue (διήγαγεν olim Dindorf, διήρκεσεν Camper, δι’ ἀλλαγὴν | ἐλευθερώσει Heimsoeth, δὴ λέξεσθαι olim Wecklein) may be augmented by διηγύαγεν denuo Naber (*Mnemos.* n.s. x [1882], 158), θήσει ταχὺ | ἐλευθεροῦσθαι Blaydes (*Adu. crit.* 124) and δι’ ἡλυσιν | ἡλευθέρωσε uel ἐλευθερώσει Harry (*Greek tragic poets* [Cincinnati 1914], 116).

serve as an illustration of whatever sentiment was expressed in the preceding line. Return from exile gives no such connection.

I suggest διώλβισεν, 'this day has brought you thorough good fortune', as *Pho.* 1689 ἐν ἡμέρῳ μ' ὥλβισ'.¹ The change of διωλ- to διηλ- has its counterpart at *Su.* 162 ὥλεσε Musurus, ἤλασε L. The verb διολβίζειν may stand alongside διαδιφρεύειν, διακανάσσειν, διαπαλύνειν, διασφαιρίζειν, διευνᾶν, διορθεύειν, as a compound which has left no other mark on literature beyond a solitary appearance in Euripides. It must, nevertheless, be acknowledged (as Professor Page has warned me) that examples of δια compounded with verbs of this semantic class are hard to find: no διαζηλοῦν, διευδαιμονίζειν, διαμακαρίζειν, nor διαφιλεῖν, διαποθεῖν, διεχθαίρειν, διαστέργειν, nor, before Aristotle, διαμισεῖν. But διατιμᾶν at Aesch. *Sépt.* 1047 might be considered an adequate analogy, if one could be confident that 'honour thoroughly' was the meaning of the verb in that place.

892-7

Xo. Ἐμοὶ χορὸς μὲν ἡδύς, εἰ λίγεια λω-
τοῦ χάρις † ἐνὶ δαί†
εἴη δ' εὐχάρις Ἀφροδί-
τα· τερπνὸν δέ τι καὶ φίλων ἀρ'
εὐτυχίαν ἰδέσθαι
τῶν πάρος οὐ δοκούντων.

In *P.C.Ph.S.* n.s. xv (1969), 41, I said of the words εἴη δ' εὐχάρις Ἀφροδίτα ('and may Aphrodite be gracious') that 'this feeble motiveless appeal disrupts the continuity of thought: "the dance is pleasing (χορὸς μὲν ἡδύς) . . . but it is also pleasant to see one's friends prosper (τερπνὸν δέ τι κτλ.)"'. I said that continuity was restored by Madvig's² ἡδεῖα δ' for εἴη δ' ('the dance is pleasing, Aphrodite is pleasing, but it is also pleasant . . .'), but I suggested that we might dispense with the copula δ' and replace εἴη δ' by the simple anagram ἡδεῖ. This conjecture is invalidated and Madvig's conjecture is corroborated by one feature of style which I failed to appreciate. Since Dr. C. F. L. Austin and Mr. M. D. Reeve have also failed to appreciate it—for had they done so they would not have argued in the way they do in *Maia* xxii (1970), 11-12—I set down a series of citations for our joint instruction: *Ba.* 902-11 εὐδαίμων μὲν ὃς ἐκ θαλάσσης | ἔφυγε χεῖμα λιμένα δ' ἔκικεν· | εὐδαίμων δ' ὃς ὑπερθε μόχθων | ἐγένεθ'· ἑτέροι δ' ἕτερος ἕτερον | ὀλβωὶ καὶ δυνάμει παρηλθεν | . . . τὸ δὲ κατ' ἡμᾶρ ὅττω βίος | εὐδαίμων μακαρίζω, fr. 316 γύναι, καλὸν (Herwerden, φίλον Stob.) μὲν φέγγος ἡλίου τόδε, | καλὸν δὲ πόντου χεῦμ' ἰδεῖν εὐήμεμον | . . . ἀλλ' οὐδὲν οὕτω λαμπρὸν οὐδ' ἰδεῖν καλὸν | ὥς κτλ., fr. 1059 δεινὴ μὲν ἀλκὴ κυμάτων θαλασσιῶν, | δειναὶ δὲ ποταμῶν καὶ πυρὸς θερμοῦ πνοαί, | δεινὸν δὲ πενία, δεινὰ δ' ἄλλα μυρία· | ἀλλ' οὐδὲν οὕτω δεινὸν ὥς γυνὴ κακόν, Asclepiades *Anth. Pal.* 5. 169 (Gow-Page, *Hell. ep.* 812-15) ἡδὺν θέρους διψῶντι ζωὴν ποτόν, ἡδὺν δὲ ναύταις | ἐκ χειμῶνος ἰδεῖν εἰαρινὸν Στέφανον· | ἡδιον δ' ὁπόταν κρύψῃ μία τοὺς φιλέοντας | χλαῖνα καὶ αἰνήται Κύπρις ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων, Lucr. 2. 1 ff. *suaue mari magno turbantibus aequora uentis | e terra magnum alterius spectare laborem . . . suaue etiam belli certamina magna tueri . . . sed nil dulcius est . . .* These are examples of one variety of the figure which is known as 'Priamel'. Conviction of the rightness of Madvig's conjecture will be further strengthened by a reading of

¹ Conversely *Hec.* 285 τὸν πάντα δ' ὄλβον ἡμᾶρ ἐν μ' ἀφείλετο.

² *Tidskrift for Phil. og Paedag.* v (1864), 14.

Haupt independently conjectured ἡδεῖα τ' in *Hermes* viii (1874), 1 = *Opusc.* iii (1876), 602.

Fraenkel's note on Aesch. *Ag.* 899–902. To the discussions of this figure mentioned by him add H. F. Johansen, *General reflection in tragic rhesis* (Copenhagen 1959), 18–20, 42–4. But Dr. Austin and Mr. Reeve are not satisfied with the sense which Madvig and I create: “‘Aphrodite, when she is charming, is delightful’ [their translation] comes perilously close to a tautology.” So it does, if you insist on limiting *χάρις* to a pretty face and a winsome manner. What the chorus means is illustrated by *Medea*, second stasimon, and *Hippolytus*, *passim*.¹

In place of †ἐνὶ δαί† I conjectured ἐνδέδαιεν, and this conjecture has drawn from Dr. Austin and Mr. Reeve the following comment: ‘Dr. Diggle’s new verb ἐνδέδαιεν in 893 is at the mercy of εἰ, by which he is evidently embarrassed, and rightly: “to me the dance is pleasing if (when) the shrill charm of the flute has blazed up in it.” Two kinds of dance, and the flute makes all the difference?’ My ‘new verb’ has been in existence for about three millennia and is at the mercy of nothing but the vagaries of Dr. Austin’s and Mr. Reeve’s reasoning faculties. Put it in this way: ‘if the flautist strikes up a tune, I like to dance.’ And now let Dr. Austin and Mr. Reeve protest that a person who makes such a statement is announcing that he will never dance to the accompaniment of an orchestra.²

998–9

καὶ γὰρ ἐχθρὸς ὦν
ἀκούσεται † γ’ ἐσθλὰ χρηστὸς ὦν ἀνὴρ.

Eurystheus promises to give his former enemy Heracles the credit which is his due. There are fifteen conjectures to record. First, two which are impossible: ἀκούσεθ’ ἡμῶν ἐσθλὰ Reiske, ὅμως ἀκούσεται ἐσθλὰ Cobet, *Nou. lect.* 222. Next, six which are unthinkable: ἀκούσεται μὲν ἐσθλὰ Scaliger, ἀκούσεται τις ἐσθλὰ Dindorf, ἀκούσεται τὰρ ἐσθλὰ uel γ’ ἀρέστ’ ἀρεστὸς Wecklein olim, καίπερ ἐχθρὸς ὦν | ἀκούσεται γὰρ ἐσθλὰ Nauck, ἤκουσεν ἂν πάντ’ ἐσθλὰ Blaydes, *Adu. crit. in Eur.* 129. A few moments’ thought is earned by the remainder. (i) ἀκούσεται γε χρηστὰ Mekler, *Euripidea* (Vienna 1879), 4–5, printed by Wecklein but improbably violent. (ii) ἀκούσεται <’μοῦ> γ’ ἐσθλὰ Lenting, <’μοί> Wilamowitz, *Hermes* xvii (1882), 362 = *Kl. Schriften*, i. 106. Wilamowitz’s conjecture is printed by Murray, but there is no good reason why either ‘μοῦ or ‘μοί should have dropped out of the line, and analogy does not favour the insertion of a dative or genitive without preposition: 718 Ζεὺς ἐξ ἐμοῦ μὲν οὐκ ἀκούσεται κακῶς, *Soph. Ai.* 1235 ἀκούειν μεγάλη πρὸς δούλων κακά, *Ph.* 1074–5 ἀκούσομαι μὲν ὡς ἔφην οἴκτου πλέως | πρὸς τοῦδε. Furthermore, ‘there are no certain cases of prodelision after *αι* in tragedy’, Platnauer, *C.Q.* x (1960), 141.³

¹ I never expected to see even the unemended text misinterpreted as it is by T. B. L. Webster, *The tragedies of Euripides* (London 1967), 104: ‘The chorus sing . . . that victory means dancing and music and women.’

² In the same article, p. 39, I suggested *τυμάρορον* for τὰ νῦν δορός at 396. As an alternative one might also consider *δορυσσόον* (cf. 774). To the inquiry of Dr. Austin and Mr. Reeve, p. 11, “‘Vengeful” the Argive army may fitly be called by one of its number, but by Demophon?”, I reply that line 283 comes before and not after line 396.

³ Of the three possible instances in Euripides adduced by him, at least one may be withdrawn: at *I.A.* 1435 there is no fault in παῦσαί με μὴ κάκιζε (see Barrett on *Hi.* 503–4). But I do not regard this as a strong argument; and Platnauer is certainly wrong in denying prodelision after *ει*. Such readings as *Soph. Ph.* 360 ἐπεὶ δάκρυσα and *O.C.* 1602 ταχεὶ πόρευσαν are not to be defended by the plea that the syllabic augment may be omitted in messenger speeches (for the conditions under which such omission is found see Page on *Med.* 1141), and εἰ ‘πιταξόμεσθα is irremovable at *Eur. Su.* 521, a line which

(iii) ἀκούσεται <τά> γ' ἐσθλὰ Canter, γε τὰσθλὰ Rauchenstein, *N. Jahrb. f. Philol.* ci (1870), 585. Though Canter's τὰ could easily disappear after ἀκούσεται, the article is out of place: Soph. *Ai.* 1324 ἤκουσεν αἰσχροῖα, *Ph.* 1313 ἤκου' ἄριστα, *Pi. Isth.* 5. 13 εἰ . . . λόγον ἐσλὸν ἀκούηι, *Xen. Cyr.* 7. 1. 13 καλὰ ἀκούειν. (iv) ἀκούσεται γ' <οὖν> ἐσθλὰ Headlam, *J. Ph.* xxvi (1899), 237, printed by Pearson and Méridier. Such an apodotic γοῦν is appropriate enough (Denniston, *Greek particles*, 453), but the dwindling of γοῦν to γ' is unexpected.

Finally, a different approach is attempted by H. D. Broadhead, *Tragica* (Christchurch 1968), 143–4. He takes together the words ἀκούσεται . . . χρηστός ὢν ἀνὴρ in the sense 'he will be called a good man' and attaches Canter's <τά> γ' ἐσθλὰ (or his own conjecture γ' <ἐς> ἐσθλὰ) to χρηστός, 'a good man and true in the matter of glorious (valiant) deeds'.¹ In support of the expression ἀκούσεται χρηστός may be quoted Soph. *O.C.* 988 ἀκούσομαι κακός, and the addition of the participle is not objectionable. But I can say nothing in favour of the empty and tautologous phrase τὰ γ' (or γ' ἐς) ἐσθλὰ χρηστός, which means barely more than 'a good man in the matter of good deeds'. When Broadhead says that his interpretation 'avoids the extreme awkwardness of making the second participial phrase [χρηστός ὢν] to be parallel in construction to the first [ἐχθρὸς ὢν]', I am not sure that the awkwardness is extreme. But awkwardness or clumsiness there is, and it may be held as a merit of the following conjecture that it eliminates that fault:

καὶ γὰρ ἐχθρὸς ὢν
ἀκούσεται γ' ἐσθλ' <οἷ>α χρηστός ὢν ἀνὴρ.

The letters *OI* will disappear without difficulty in the sequence *ΕΣΘΛΟΙΑ*. For the turn of phrase see Soph. *O.T.* 750–1 πότερον ἐχώρει βαιός, ἢ πολλοὺς ἔχων | ἄνδρας λοχίτας οἷ' ἀνὴρ ἀρχηγέτης, 763–4 ἄξιός γὰρ οἷ' (Hermann, δ γ' L, ὦς γ' Musgrave) ἀνὴρ | δοῦλος φέρειν ἦν τῇσδε καὶ μείζω χάριν, Eur. *Andr.* 911 μῶν ἐς γυναικ' ἔρραιφας οἷα δὴ γυνή; *Ba.* 291 Ζεὺς δ' ἀντεμνηχανήσασθ' οἷα δὴ θεός. The participle is added in Thuc. 2. 5. 4 οἷα ἀπροσδοκίτου κακοῦ ἐν εἰρήνῃ γενομένου and 8. 95. 2 οἷα πόλεώς τε στασιαζούσης καὶ . . . βουλόμενοι βοηθήσαι, and regularly in Herodotus, as for example 3. 25. 2 οἷα δὲ ἔμμανής τε ἔων καὶ οὐ φρενήρης, 7. 6. 1 οἷα νεωτέρων ἔργων ἐπιθυμητὴς ἔων.

Queens' College, Cambridge

JAMES DIGGLE

I do not share Platnauer's difficulty in translating, provided that the comma which editors place after οὕτως is placed before that word. I should therefore accept Pearson's αἰεὶ <μ>βεβάναι at line 610 of our play. Pearson later made a similar conjecture at Soph. *Tr.* 940 αἰτίαι <μ>βάλοι. This, though Platnauer seems reluctant to accept it, is one of the three Sophoclean conjectures of

Pearson which Housman commended as 'evidently true' (*C.R.* xxxix [1925], 77).

¹ He is wrong to ascribe this interpretation of Canter's conjecture to Canter, who takes τὰ γ' ἐσθλὰ as object of ἀκούσεται ('tamen a me praedicabitur, cum fuerit uir excellens'), as do the commentators who accept this conjecture.